



**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**  
**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002**

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2, AND ARE CLOSED CAPTIONED FOR OUR HEARING IMPAIRED VIEWERS. THE COUNCIL MEETING, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER KCLV PROGRAMMING, CAN BE VIEWED AT [www.kclv.tv](http://www.kclv.tv). THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 AND THE WEB ON WEDNESDAY AT 12:00 AM, FRIDAY AT 4:00 PM, THE FOLLOWING WEDNESDAY AT 12:00 AM AND FRIDAY AT 4:00 PM.

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**MINUTES:**

PRESENT: MAYOR GOODMAN and COUNCIL MEMBERS REESE, M. McDONALD (excused until 2:01 p.m. and from 3:07 to 3:26 p.m.), BROWN, L.B. McDONALD (excused after 1:31 p.m.), WEEKLY, and MACK

Also Present: CITY MANAGER VIRGINIA VALENTINE, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER STEVE HOUCHENS, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC, and CITY CLERK BARBARA JO RONEMUS

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North  
Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road  
Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway  
Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall  
City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(1:26)

**1-1**

MAYOR GOODMAN led the audience in the Pledge.

(1:27)

**1-18**

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002**

**DEPARTMENT: BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT**

**DIRECTOR: LESA CODER**

☐

**CONSENT**

☒

**DISCUSSION**

**SUBJECT:**

Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 ) - Ward 5 (Weekly)

**Fiscal Impact**

☒

**No Impact**

**Amount:**

☐

**Budget Funds Available**

**Dept./Division:**

☐

**Augmentation Required**

**Funding Source:**

**PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

In order to update the City Council regarding the development of the 61 acre parcel, a summary of information, market & feasibility findings will be performed by Economic Research Associates, Ellerbe Becket, Innova and JB Research for Parkway Center mixed-use development.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Direct staff accordingly.

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Site Map
2. ERA Addendum

**MOTION:**

**REESE – Motion to follow the recommendations of staff – UNANIMOUS with M. McDONALD not voting and L.B. McDONALD abstaining because she works with DRS. HARDER and MILLER of the University of Nevada, School of Medicine on the academic medical center project**

**MINUTES:**

CITY MANAGER VALENTINE advised that a brief history of the site would be given by MR. NIARCHOS, legal counsel to the Redevelopment Agency for this project, and a presentation on the ERA Addendum by JEFF COHEN. Others present to provide specialized resource information upon request by the Council include JILL BENTLEY, JB Research, DEAN MILLER, University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine, LESA CODER, Director of the Office of Business Development, DON SNYDER, Las Vegas Performing Arts Center, and RICKY REES and MICHAEL CRAMER, Southwest Sports Realty. PETER TRICE, NNOVA,

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002**

**Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003)**

and JIM NISCHNICK, Ellerbe Becket, were available by telephone conference. Lastly, CRAIG HOLT was present as a neutral party to assist the Council in answering several key questions regarding the future of the site based on the City's goals, priorities and mission/vision statements. The goal of the meeting was to identify a consensus regarding the preferred land uses for the site and the roles of the Mayor/Council, City staff and the developer.

NICK NIARCHOS summarized that the City acquired the land through an exchange with Lehman Brothers for City land in the Las Vegas Technology Center in the Northwest. Various proposals were submitted and through an extensive process was narrowed down to a few options. Southwest Sports Realty was selected as having the best proposal and the City began to negotiate for an interim agreement for due diligence or feasibility analysis on development alternatives as well as a final agreement with Southwest Sports Realty to act as a master development manager for the site. The interim agreement expired on April 5, 2002, but was extended for an additional 90 days.

MR. NIARCHOS outlined the current status of various studies involving the feasibility of the entire site, a performing arts center and a design charrette process. Extensive negotiations with Southwest Sports Realty are anticipated in the next 90 days on their vision for proceeding with development of this site as well as the business agreement for them to continue as the overall development manager of the site. This is an unusual process with many components, which takes time, but in this instance has proceeded, in a normal fashion.

JEFF COHEN, ERA, stated that the addendum includes more definitive statements regarding a development strategy for the medical center, performing arts center and baseball stadium proposals for this site. The conclusion reached was that two of the three uses would be highly recommended with off-site options which would be very beneficial to the site which include the monorail system, the Chelsea project, the furniture mart warehouse and multi-transportation on I-15. The addendum also addressed commercial office space, market rates on residential uses and reached a conclusion that all three would require a political tie and a cost-benefit as to which benefits the City the most from a tourist standpoint, a local resident standpoint and from a City standpoint. All three would spur development.

MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with MR. COHEN about a recommendation that would be worthwhile or appropriate for the City to underwrite an academic medical center. However, there were no recommendations regarding subsidies for a performing arts center and minor league baseball stadium. The Council requested an opinion as to such subsidies and ERA found that such subsidies would not be cost-effective. MAYOR GOODMAN confirmed with MR.

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002****Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )**

COHEN that the findings were strictly dollar and cents and did not include philosophical issues. However, the opinion was that if two uses were subsidized, the third could proceed without a subsidy. MAYOR GOODMAN stressed that he has learned that the City has a responsibility and obligations beyond economic dollars and cents. In his opinion, this property should be used for something that is both an economic benefit and an enhancement to the quality of life for the Valley into the future.

CRAIG HOLT explained his purpose in guiding the conversation through this complex process. This Council obviously understands that this property involves both economic and philosophical questions. Both staff and the developer are seeking direction regarding leading development land use, other uses within the master development and fiscal considerations. The direction from Council will be built upon the City's compelling vision statement and established priorities identified in a past Council workshop, all of which he read into the record. These types of collective priorities create tension.

COUNCILMAN REESE affirmed with MR. HOLT and CITY MANAGER VALENTINE that the Council will establish the direction on multiple developments and then later examine individual projects. MR. HOLT added that the Council might give direction to do no project, only one project on the site or to do multiple projects, which might include all three projects currently proposed, any combination of the three or be expanded to include projects which have yet to be proposed. For example, the high-rise hotel would fall under the category "other uses". The determination as to anchors will drive some of the other decisions. COUNCILMAN REESE stressed that his concern was that anything discussed must be viable.

MR. HOLT asked if the Council desired the academic medical center be included in the development of the 61 acres. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY responded that a consensus of the Council was that there is a lack of these types of facilities in the City and, in turn, was the driving force behind support for that project. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated that such a medical center would be the most important thing that could be placed on this site. He questioned the space to be allocated and made a comparison to an existing facility and a proposed facility in San Francisco. Such a facility is essential for the City of Las Vegas to reach the next level of sophistication and, according to studies already performed, will create necessary economic diversification if done right.

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002****Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )**

MR. HOLT confirmed with MAYOR GOODMAN that development should involve multi-use, but there was uncertainty as to specifically which uses. COUNCILMAN BROWN responded that there were additional questions to be answered regarding independent or incorporated development of the 61 acres with the existing downtown and the timeline involved. MAYOR GOODMAN stated that the 61 acres are the jewel of the desert and will be developed as a component of the entire downtown. These types of projects, when successful, are dynamic. The medical center in Houston has generated over \$10 billion into the Houston economy. It is crucial that the development proceed as quickly as possible, subject to smart planning on this limited amount of land. He personally supported this developer because of the way in which their architect incorporated the two sides of the tracks into one large downtown through a weaving of streets. The worst thing that could happen would be to build something that jeopardized the old downtown. MR. HOLT replied that the timing is very important and confirmed with the individual members of the Council that they anticipated a multiple development of the site.

MR. HOLT requested that the Council identify a scheduling sequence or scaling of the multiple developments. If possible, he asked the Council to list their individual ordering of the proposed projects and/or add any additional suggestions. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY stressed that the academic medical center was primary and would have to include secondary uses such as residential components. MAYOR GOODMAN described the apartment complex where his son lives adjacent to a New York hospital, which has special elevators and a tunnel to avoid outside traffic. It would seem that some type of residential use would come with the academic medical center.

MR. HOLT stressed that this project provides a rare opportunity for the City to make decisions on the front end. The anchor use or uses will draw the residential and other secondary uses. They do not require the same type of policy decisions as for the big anchor uses. MAYOR GOODMAN advised that he believes that the academic medical center will be an economic success. He would view projects differently if he were convinced they would be successful. Currently he has fears that the projects could become white elephants. Further, he would judge success independently and in conjunction with existing facilities such as Cashman and Reed Whipple. COUNCILMAN McDONALD confirmed with MR. HOLT that the big box developments under discussion were the academic medical center, performing arts center and stadium.

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Business Department

Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )

MAYOR GOODMAN asked DON SNYDER to advise the Council why the performing arts center would be successful and how he envisioned the financing. MR. SNYDER responded that his experience downtown had given him a great deal of empathy for downtown. It is important that the 61-acre development create synergy with downtown. There exists a tremendous opportunity with this property to create an economic engine for the entire Valley, generate spin off development and have a positive impact on the university system.

MR. SNYDER outlined his involvement with a potential performing arts center as far back as 1994 when STEVE and ELAINE WYNN convened a meeting bringing together people from the public and private sector to energize the conversation. There have been a number of studies to advance the dialogue. There has been strong support for such a center to enhance the quality of life for residents and as a draw to attract business. A world-class center would have a very positive effect on the educational system. Other than providing the land, the City would probably not have to participate in the fund raising aspect. A joint resolution was passed by the Legislature unanimously in support of a world-class performing arts center in the downtown area of Las Vegas. Bonding was examined at the time the resolution was passed as a way to fund the structure itself. Experience around the country shows that a solid operational foundation is essential for a facility to be successful, affordable and accessible to the people and school district. The intent is to raise between \$60 to \$70 million in endowments, covering the structure and operations. It is anticipated the initial build out would cost approximately \$100 million and then continue with build out after that. This would be similar to the Orange County Performing Arts Center. Other examples have established guidelines for success in building, financing and operation. A tremendous amount of business has developed around the Orange County facility.

MAYOR GOODMAN expressed a concern about drawing people, tourists and locals both, away from existing activities. MR. SNYDER noted that the facility needs to be built for the existing residents and those who will move here. A world-class community must have world-class elements. That includes an academic medical center and a performing arts center. It is important to remember that these types of amenities require a great deal of time to develop. A performing arts center takes an average of 20 years. Las Vegas may be able to accomplish things faster than most communities. Synergy stimulates other development, such as office uses. Parking can be shared between day uses and this type of evening/weekend use. Experience also shows that people like to live and work around these types of amenities.

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002****Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )**

MAYOR GOODMAN concurred, pointing out that people and businesses looking to relocate ask about education, culture and other amenities. The next question would be whether this would be the appropriate site versus somewhere further out like West Charleston near the mountains and whether existing residents would utilize the center. MR. SNYDER answered that there has been discussion by two different groups, his group supporting a site downtown and the other looking at the suburbs. His group considered the central location key to better access and association with the educational system. Equally important is that it will enhance the downtown as the business and cultural hub of the Valley. This is an once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. MAYOR GOODMAN verified that the Valley could not support two cultural/performing arts centers. MR. SNYDER concurred that funding efforts could not support two facilities and the location is an overall catalyst. Given the desire to keep the facility central, his group has looked at being more judicious in the land plan, use of a smaller piece of land and incorporating common parking and other amenities. Phasing has also been examined. That would allow success to generate more success. However, a crystallized site is essential to move forward with fund raising in the private sector. That funding in turn allows legislative support to be sought for actual construction of the facility.

MAYOR GOODMAN discussed with MR. SNYDER that the minimum site, even with master planning, would need to be at least 5 to 5.5 acres. An independent facility would require something in the 10-acre range to provide for replicated amenities and parking. Eliminating those replications also makes the project more cost-effective. MAYOR GOODMAN questioned whether residential elements were incorporated into the center's complex. The rendering presented included two high-rise residential structures called Symphony Towers with the performing arts center at the foot of those towers. That would accomplish two things at the same time. MR. SNYDER agreed that this type of low-intensity use stimulates and is very compatible with residential or office structures.

COUNCILMAN McDONALD complimented the efforts of MR. SNYDER'S group and asked the size of the actual facility. Certainly there are arguments for a central downtown location, especially when factoring in the monorail system. MR. SNYDER explained that the project starts with 2,000 seats in a world-class facility and then amenities such as a 600 to 800 seat smaller theater would be added later. There has also been discussion regarding a third, smaller theater with approximately 200 seats, if appropriate. The advantage of this type of program is that the additions can be done in phases after the world-class facility. COUNCILMAN McDONALD strongly supported the educational aspect and described his parents' efforts to open various cultural doors for him. MR. SNYDER described past conversations with past Clark County School District Superintendent BRIAN CRAM, as well as current administration, who

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Business Department

Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )

feel the integration of this type of programming would be a tremendous advantage to the school system. It would also minimize the level of investment made by that entity into their program at Las Vegas High School.

COUNCILMAN MACK commended MR. SNYDER for his interest and experience, which he brings to the table on these issues. He concurred that there should be just one facility, but would be very concerned were it not to be in the downtown area. MR. SNYDER stressed that the land previously discussed in Summerlin is no longer available through Howard Hughes. Having a site would add weight to the attempt to consolidate these efforts. MAYOR GOODMAN considered the combining of a school administrative building, which would bring an additional 1500 related employees downtown. CITY MANAGER VALENTINE clarified that the site currently of interest to the other performing arts center group is on BLM property. Regarding the administrative building, there is currently no funding available but a private group is trying to raise money. That building would be ineligible for bond funding. MR. SNYDER rebutted that the synergy could advance conversation in the direction outlined.

MAYOR GOODMAN raised a hypothetical question, that if the City approved a five-acre downtown site and assisted with the 10-acre BLM site, giving both groups a five-year time period to construct a building, whether both projects would fail. MR. SNYDER responded that each group's fund raising would be slowed and the community would lose. A determination needs to be made as to one facility and one location, with everyone then supporting that one project. His group believes that the best site would be downtown. MAYOR GOODMAN concurred, reiterating his comments on economic accessibility as well as the central location.

BOB FORBUSS indicated that the Clark County Education Foundation, which has raised approximately \$20 million in the past, has discussed a key project involving the identification of a location for the education center. Land has been set aside on Flamingo and other locations, but the project is not yet energized. The consensus of the Executive Board is that it needs to be in a more centralized location. That organization would also be the catalyst for fund raising for such a project, barring any legislative initiative to provide room tax or other bonding revenue. However, it is unlikely such funding will happen during the next legislative session. There is considerable discussion that the Flamingo site is not a good idea. It would make a wonderful combination to include it on the 61-acre site, adding synergy to a variety of projects. MR. SNYDER agreed that such a proposal would generate a great deal of private sector support. A lot could be accomplished in five years on a performing arts center under a narrow focus. Integrating the facility with a Clark County School District Administrative building would create a lot of positive things.



**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002**

**Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )**

MAYOR GOODMAN requested an opinion from MR. NIARCHOS regarding the impact to the success of this development by surrounding projects. MR. NIARCHOS replied that the uses could be very complimentary to each other and generate an attractive synergy. The more people drawn downtown or working downtown, the greater the attendance at a center and secondary uses such as restaurants. MAYOR GOODMAN expressed a concern with drawing patrons away from other projects, such as Neonopolis, and whether both could be successful. Does the City have a sufficient population base to support both? MR. NIARCHOS pointed out that the more choices available, the more people who will be drawn downtown.

COUNCILMAN BROWN expressed a concern with some of the assumptions made in the study regarding costs, fund raising amounts required and the potential generation of people in the downtown area as well as issues involving two performing arts centers and the possible reduction of patrons at existing facilities. There must be a reality check as to what the City can do financially in choosing one or more of these proposals and assist with moving them forward. This is especially true given the budget information provided at the budget hearing. The cost per person or subsidized cost per person is not the only factor upon which to evaluate these projects. The tangible as well as the intangible must be weighed. MR. HOLT stressed that anyone could make decisions if it were just a numbers game. Cost and funding mechanisms are key. Leveraged synergy by blending common resources and uses with diverse hours of operation can maximize space at this early stage.

MICHAEL KRAMER expressed appreciation for the Council's unanimous support of incorporating the entire downtown into this process versus development of only the 61 acres. His organization is committed to whatever is more beneficial. For example, a large K-Mart might fill the space but would not create cross over beneficial development for the existing downtown. That type of development would not create secondary development and could create a problem in 20 years. Downtown must be addressed from a holistic standpoint.

MR. KRAMER advised that his organization has no connection with the team at Cashman. They have worked with the team's parent organization Mandalay in North Dallas. Experience has shown that sports teams activate downtown areas. This has proven true in Dallas, Louisville, Cleveland, Toledo and other cities. Stadiums also draw secondary uses such as residential, retail, commercial and office uses. The stadium could work but he concurred with the ERA report finding that if the academic medical center, performing arts center and Chelsea project are constructed properly along with the monorail, there would not be enough space or a need for the stadium. However, if the 13 to 15 factors, which are impediments to the academic medical center, prevent or delay construction for the next five

years, the City cannot just put redevelopment on hold. The architect is working on renderings, which include various

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Business Department

Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )

alternative combinations. It is critical that the design of the site place the various uses in a manner that ties to existing downtown uses. This City's growth demands a real downtown and will support any one of the three uses identified. There is a demand for the City to think ten years into the future.

**RECESSED: 2:56 – 3:07 p.m.**

MR. KRAMER outlined his organization's vision of creating a master plan for this site that is best for Las Vegas and involves meeting the demands of the future. As they bring forward various projects, they will seek assistance from the Council with incentives. The process only begins in 90 days and stretches well into the future beyond the master development agreement itself.

Each of the proposals already presented have been evaluated in the ERA report. However, the market study is not the same as a cost analysis. There are other considerations, which may arise in the future. For example, it would not be the worst thing if there is so much development and cross over redevelopment that there is a need for more land. Key is getting a start and addressing the subsequent incentives and secondary use issues as they arise. Some of the requested incentives may be absolutely impossible. Other times an entity must find a way to provide the amenities necessary to be a world-class city. Private donors have provided such facilities in other places, such as in Fort Worth where the Bass family almost single-handedly built a world-class performing arts center. The cost-benefit analysis alone of these amenities could never justify the expense, but the amenities are essential. The real justification for these amenities is the demand for other services and the development it drives. The same balancing act between cost benefit, need and amenity exists with the academic medical center. However, a hospital alone does not energize the existing downtown and developing the entire medical complex could take as long as 50 years. Existing downtown cannot wait that long.

MR. KRAMER summarized a hypothetical example of a \$35 million stadium with \$20 million of City, County or State money and \$10 million of private money. The government's investment would be paid back through rent over 20 to 25 years. The site would be activated and generate tremendous population in the area. That in turn would generate residential or office uses with a view into the stadium. The other uses proposed at this time would involve a longer pay back and take much longer to develop. This type of expertise, along with their business contacts, is what his organization can offer in energizing the site and tying it to the existing downtown, subject to direction from the Council.

**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002**

**Business Department**

**Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )**

MR. HOLT requested that the Council discuss their priorities and direction. MAYOR GOODMAN commented on a past issue raised by COUNCILMAN BROWN regarding who was driving this process. He indicated that the Council must be kept informed as they are ultimately responsible and accountable to the public, but they are not interested in micromanagement. MR. HOLT confirmed that the purpose of this portion of the meeting is to frame the roles of Council, staff and the lead developer. Only the Council can balance its mission statement with the empirical data of a project.

During the discussion seeking direction on advancing the three proposals already submitted, MAYOR GOODMAN stated that he will keep an open mind during the process but he would not be able to see a minor league stadium on the site or support the use of tax dollars for such.

MAYOR GOODMAN commented that IRWIN MOLASKY, a prominent developer with significant experience in residential and commercial development, has expressed doubts as to what will attract residential development into the area. COUNCILMAN MACK indicated that he would rely on the expertise of the master developer to identify the components and the phasing of those components. MR. HOLT stressed that this is only guidance to the developer as a starting point. The recommendations as to specifics, after study and evaluation, may include an explanation as to why the initial, generalized guidance does not work.

COUNCILMAN BROWN confirmed that the discussion was broadly incorporating both the 61 acres and the existing downtown. Therefore the final master plan would identify the anchor developments on the 61 acres but would also hypothetically include in any evaluation the related residential project located at Third and Gass. MAYOR GOODMAN concurred that the process must meld and integrate the area and even expand out into the entire community.

COUNCILMAN BROWN discussed with MR. NIARCHOS the components of the development agreement with Southwest Sports Realty. The agreement is envisioned to include a number of plan alternatives. Southwest Sports Realty will then be the party charged with doing all the nuts and bolts planning, including infrastructure, supervising subsequent construction and alternate financing options. The business agreement related to this will identify their fees and incentives. The overall goal is to put Southwest Sports Realty in a place where the dirt is turned over to them to implement and execute the approved plan. Nothing today or under the agreement, which may be reached in 90 days, will obligate the Council to do anything that is not a good deal financially or politically for the City. Southwest Sports Realty needs something to evidence a meeting of

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Business Department

Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )

the minds so that they can bring forward transactions with some level of comfort that the projects are consistent with the Council's goals. That is required to be able to aggressively market the property.

COUNCILMAN BROWN pointed out concerns with the proximity of the stadium to the civic arena and the impact of each of those on existing facilities such as Cashman Field currently proposed for a Convention Authority retrofit and Reed Whipple. He confirmed that the master planner/developer would be responsible for taking those matters into consideration when planning for projected synergy of the area. Similarly, the plan will include recommendations developed through the design charrette regarding infrastructure, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular overpasses and one-way streets. At the end of 90 days, a determination will be made if all these matters have been addressed by the agreement reached.

MR. KRAMER outlined the intention for the plan to include the manner in which to get across the tracks and the best way to do so. One of the responsibilities of the master developer after reaching an agreement will be to contact properties on the other side to work together on common plazas and other aspects to draw people across. As that cross over occurs, it will be the responsibility of the Council to control focused development downtown. COUNCILMAN REESE stressed that the City has been very proactive in efforts to bring people downtown. The access and cross over must go both directions.

MR. HOLT reiterated that the generalized directions staff and the developer are seeking are not absolutes. The next question is whether sequencing is important to the Council. COUNCILMAN WEEKLY responded that sequencing is critical. No matter what development would be desirous, paying for the development may be the impassible roadblock. MR. HOLT explained that financing will be addressed, but during this fragment of this complex conversation, only preferred sequencing is being reviewed. MAYOR GOODMAN established the academic medical center as his first priority. COUNCILMAN McDONALD concurred. The City is already at a critical shortage of doctors and hospital beds. COUNCILMAN REESE supported a single performing arts center as well.

MR. HOLT requested direction on prioritizing the secondary land uses of residential, commercial, retail and/or a hotel/casino. MAYOR GOODMAN indicated his belief that it is essential that the residential be ownership in nature and can be successful versus COUNCILMAN McDONALD'S support of rental residential. COUNCILMAN REESE pointed out that until existing rental and ownership residential as well as office space downtown is full

## SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Business Department

Item #1 - Discussion and possible action regarding the development of 100 South Grand Central Parkway (aka City Parkway V - APN 139-34-110-002 and City Parkway IV - APN 139-34-110-003 )

and successful, additional development of these types could be adverse to existing downtown development. COUNCILMAN McDONALD stated that his vision would include a Turnberry project adjacent to the academic medical center. MAYOR GOODMAN and several Councilmen encouraged the idea of a new hotel/casino as well. The consensus was that the remaining secondary uses would flow from the success of the anchor projects. MR. KRAMER and MR. HOLT concurred that the secondary land uses will act as infill and be commensurate with the anchor project or projects.

MR. HOLT attempted to establish the Council's position regarding subsidies and incentives. MAYOR GOODMAN explained that he would have to reach a comfort level with individual projects before he would consider any incentive or subsidy beyond the contribution of the land. COUNCILMAN McDONALD concurred. COUNCILMAN MACK stressed that it must be a case-by-case review just as has been done for other downtown redevelopment projects. COUNCILMAN BROWN noted that the ERA report anticipated significant public subsidies in addition to the land. He would like to see what other municipalities have done and the range of opportunities available, with the leading developments proposed and any brought forward in the future. MR. HOLT confirmed that there was nothing off the table that would not even be considered and reminded the Council that when by providing subsidies, the City becomes a major investor. MAYOR GOODMAN added that ERA is an expert and the Council would utilize their report and recommendations as a road map.

Lastly, MR. HOLT discussed clarification of the roles of the parties in this process. There is tension during this type of complex process and integration of projects. MAYOR GOODMAN replied that the roles are relatively clear. The developer is lead but works closely with the Office of Business Development and Planning and the Council makes the final decisions. COUNCILMAN BROWN stressed his desire that the direction given at this meeting include that the plan component tying this development to existing downtown projects such as the Fourth and Lewis Street Corridors be very clear. MAYOR GOODMAN answered that part of his support for selecting Southwest Sports Realty was the architect who integrated both sides of the tracks into his renderings.

COUNCILMAN BROWN discussed with MAYOR GOODMAN that the use of the ERA report and addendum would serve strictly as a guide for this process despite the tremendous assumptions contained within the report. The eventual agreement and plan will set out what can and cannot be done, independent of the report. MR. KRAMER agreed that there are concerns with the report and addendum. The final plan will be based on the findings of Southwest Sports Realty.

(1:28 - 4:01)

**1-36/2-1**



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**  
**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: APRIL 15, 2002**

**CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:**

Items raised under this portion of the City Council Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

**MINUTES:**

REVEREND JAMES RODGERS, 1100 North D Street, stated that there is a concern with adhering to the Agency Employment Plan Policy. The Plan includes a list of contacts for obtaining employees from the economically disadvantaged area. The 61 acres are anticipated to generate over \$300 million of development and will probably involve public funds. The citizens of Las Vegas are the owners of this property. Therefore, the developers must be required to comply with this Plan. Lastly, he was amazed that only nine minutes out of a meeting this long was used to discuss the fiscal aspects of the project.

(4:01 – 4:05)

**2-1897**

STAN WASHINGTON cited the Redevelopment Plan and Redevelopment law, which use statistical data to create the Agency. The City's census tracts for creating the Agency are based on West Las Vegas, Meadows Village and downtown. They form the basis for the City giving away land and/or subsidies in order to stimulate growth to benefit the residents of those areas. This is a good plan, but it also translates into a responsibility to ensure that those residents have the potential to benefit. The current list of employee source contacts cannot provide skilled laborers from the area. To address this situation, the training component must be provided for now in order to make sure that the targeted employment base is able to meet the future demand. If not, the objective is not accomplished. He confirmed that the development agreement must include a detailed employment plan. MAYOR GOODMAN responded that this is the master developer's agreement and not the individual developer of any specific project. MR. WASHINGTON countered that the individual developers will be bound by the agreement reached with the master developer.

(4:05 – 4:09)

**2-2057**

TOM McGOWAN, 520 South Casino Center, advised that the success of a performing arts center is based on the quality and ability to relate of the programming content. A balance of mixed economic multi-dwelling housing is imperative to such a center as well as the rest of the 61 acres. If properly executed, the center will be the start of the downtown entertainment district.

# City of Las Vegas

SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2002

Citizens Participation

## **MINUTES – Continued:**

He expressed regret over the loss of the best City Manager the City has ever had and his opinion that the only possible candidate to fill that spot would be DEPUTY CITY MANAGER BETSY FRETWELL. All but one other possible candidate would be a political expediency and a waste of time.

MR. McGOWAN reminded the Council that he first offered the City his comprehensive redevelopment plan for the entire downtown, UP Railroad Property and Westside communities twelve years ago. The revised plan was offered to the City Centre Development Corporation three years ago. There is a major difference between incremental projects versus genuine community redevelopment which must be master planned on a holistic scale. The key to community redevelopment is not redevelopment, but community. This will require private investment of between 2.5 to 5 billion dollars over a 30-year term. The ultimate cost is nothing compared to the significant compound socio-economic benefits. It appears that the City is finally heading in the right direction, but must fully integrate both downtown and the secondary downtown composed of the Bonanza Corridor. MR. McGOWAN submitted his statement as read, in writing.

(4:09 – 4:14)

**2-2251**

REVEREND CHESTER RICHARDSON advised the Council that he believed 3 of the activating proposals to include 2.5 losers. Many of the premises from the presentations were not true. It is not possible that the stadium or performing arts center have a chance of succeeding. The land needs to be developed, not just filled. He concurred with the comments of the other speakers that the project or projects must benefit both the City and the residents from the designated areas. The Redevelopment Plan must be updated. It is hoped that the academic medical center will also provide medical care and be a no-lose situation. Amazingly there is discussion about residential uses in conjunction with the medical center when residential uses have been moved away from the existing UMC hospital area.

(4:14 – 4:17)

**2-2458**

MAYOR GOODMAN thanked everyone for their participation and expressed a hope that the direction given will result in a contract that causes the City to be a better place.

**ADJOURNED: 4:17 P.M. (1-2627)**

Respectfully submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

VICKY DARLING

May 9, 2002